

COMMANDER PEARY AND SOME OF HIS AIDS; SNAPSHOTS TAKEN SINCE THEIR RETURN

CHILDREN'S SLAYER IS UNDER ARREST

Police Chief Brophy of Utica

Announces that Murder
Mystery Has Been
Solved

Accused Almost Collapsed
When Brought Into Court
to Plead—Statement by
Police Head.

Special to Farmer.)

Utica, N. Y., Sept. 27.—The Chief of Police formally announced to-day that the Ravine Tragedy which resulted in the murder of two Italian children in this city two weeks ago has been solved and that Theodore Rizzo, a Calabrian arrested here two days after the commission of the crime was the man who perpetrated the deed.

Rizzo was taken into custody this afternoon for arraignment on a warrant formally charging him with murder in the first degree. He was in a state of collapse and was unable to speak when City Magistrate O'Connor directed him to plead to the charge, so the court entered a formal plea of not guilty in the prisoner's behalf and held him for the action of the Grand Jury. It is hinted that the police have secured a complete confession from Rizzo but on this point Chief Brophy is silent. "All I will say at this time concerning this case," said Brophy, "is that the Ravine murder mystery has been solved and that the man who killed the two little ones is in our custody."

The clue which led to the apprehension of Rizzo was furnished by Fannie Infusino who was wounded at the same time, as she lay on the cot in a local hospital. She told the police that the man who perpetrated the crime was a Calabrian who had given the Procopio child's mother one cent with which to purchase postage stamps half an hour before the three children were lured to the ravine. Rizzo's arrest quickly followed and a mass of incriminating evidence rapidly developed against him. A 38 calibre revolver similar to the one which the crime was committed was found in his possession. It had just been cleaned. Then the fact developed to-day that when the murders were discovered Rizzo had left his work and changed his appearance, so much so in fact that the first time he was taken before Fannie she failed to identify him.

Rewards aggregating \$3,000 were offered for the arrest and conviction of the murderer whose motive for the crime, it has been proved, was criminal assault.

Columbus, He "Bane"

Good Fellow, But

Was 400 Years Late

Sven Murberg Says Ameri-

ca's Discoverer Came

from North and Not the

South.

Former Alderman Sven Murberg, who is now the mayor of Nicholville, stated to the Farmer this morning that he thought it was the height of audacity to locate a society to erect a monument to Christopher Columbus because he was the discoverer of America. He declared that the real discoverer of the western hemisphere was Lief Erickson, who came over to this country 400 years before Columbus.

Erickson, if there is to be a monument erected to the real bona fide discoverer of America, should be the man to whom the monument should go. Mr. Murberg does not deny that Columbus landed on the island of San Salvador in 1492 but he says that Lief Erickson maintained 400 years ahead of that time.

Rubber Plant Stolen;

Little Girl Arrested

Miss Grace Little, colored, aged 16 is held at police headquarters for the theft of a rubber plant valued at \$10 from Mrs. Jennie Reid of Courtland Hill. Detective Cronan made the arrest this morning. The girl is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Horace Little, 210 Highland avenue. Information was given Detective Cronan and the girl's arrest followed. The mother denies knowledge of the theft.

EXPLOSION IN

FILM FACTORY

INJURES FIFTY

(Special from United Press.)

Pittsburg, Sept. 27.—A terrific explosion occurred here this afternoon in the offices of the Columbian Film Exchange in the Ferguson Block on 3rd avenue. Many persons were injured and the building and its contents have been seriously damaged. The explosion fired the interior of the building and a panic followed among the occupants. Ambulances took away a number of the injured. The list of injured will reach fifty.

A. B. C. Club Dance

And Concert Tonight

Nothing doing tonight, you say. Are you aware that the popular A. B. C. club is holding a dance this evening at Brooklawn pavilion? Dances by this body of popular young men are always looked forward to as a source of delight by the younger set. There will be a concert. Among the artists featured will be Misses Florence MacAllister and Martha Hurd and the Messrs. James Keegan, Fred Mooney, George Hy, Walter Moss, James MacAllister and George Greenman. The musical end will be well taken care of by Prof. George Finklestone who is a member of the club.

MARRIAGE LICENSES

ISSUED TODAY

Marriage licenses were issued to-day to George W. Evans an accountant of Pittsburgh, Pa. to marry Miss Grace A. Patchin, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Walter E. Patchin of this city.

Other licenses were issued to William Karetchey, 22 Winter of Port Jefferson to marry Miss Ida B. Brown a waitress of the same place. The bride is 27 and the groom 22.

Thomas W. Cole of this city secured a license to marry Miss Helen Blackman of this city.

BICYCLE WAITS CLAIMANT.

Patrolman Walker found a Sterling bicycle this morning at Broad street and Railroad avenue. It is at police headquarters awaiting the owner.

NOON.—There was a weak spot in the late forenoon, Erie declining about one point. A few other issues yielded under moderate selling pressure but at midday the inherent selling disappeared and the general market became strong. Most interest centered in Steel common which held firm around 86.

PROHIBITING SEINING IN VICINITY OF DOCKS.

The town of Santa Monica passed an ordinance prohibiting seining within 1,000 feet of its docks. In Ex parte Bailey, 101 Pacific Reporter, 441, the California Supreme Court thought it manifest from the terms of the ordinance that it was in no sense designed for the preservation and protection of fish for the benefit of the state, but was clearly the sole object of the ordinance to protect and add to the piscatorial advantages of the wharves, docks, and piers in the town, and to increase the fortune of the wielders of hook and line. This being the purpose of the ordinance, it was clearly beyond the power of the town to act.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.

IN EX PARTE BAILEY, 101 PACIFIC REPORTER, 441, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT THOUGHT IT MANIFEST FROM THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE THAT IT WAS IN NO SENSE DESIGNED FOR THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF FISH FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE STATE, BUT WAS CLEARLY THE SOLE OBJECT OF THE ORDINANCE TO PROTECT AND ADD TO THE PISCATORIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHARVES, DOCKS, AND PIERS IN THE TOWN, AND TO INCREASE THE FORTUNE OF THE WIELDERS OF HOOK AND LINE. THIS BEING THE PURPOSE OF THE ORDINANCE, IT WAS CLEARLY BEYOND THE POWER OF THE TOWN TO ACT.

THE TOWN OF SANTA MONICA PASSED AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SEINING WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF ITS DOCKS.